

**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT &  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 27 September 2018

**Present:**

Councillor David Cartwright QFSM (Chairman)  
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Julian Benington,  
Mike Botting, Hannah Gray, Samaris Huntington-Thresher,  
Alexa Michael and Harry Stranger

Sharon Baldwin, Alf Kennedy and Cameron Ward

**Also Present:**

Nigel Davies, Sarah Foster, Dan Jones, Superintendent  
Craig Knight, Councillor Kate Lymer, Joanne Stowell and  
Rob Vale, PC Lisa London, and Chief Superintendent Jeff  
Boothe.

**15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF  
SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Fen Johnson, Julie Clark and Dr Robert Hadley.

**STANDARD ITEMS**

**16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**17 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE  
PUBLIC TO THE CHAIRMAN OR COMMITTEE**

There were no questions from Councillors or Members of the Public.

**18 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND  
ENFORCEMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3rd  
JULY 2018**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee held on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2018. It had been noted in the previous minutes that a Member had raised a query concerning a female in need of housing because of domestic abuse, but who had allegedly been refused help because she was not in receipt of housing benefit. Mr Vale

(Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety) had promised to investigate this and to report back to the Chairman and the Member who had raised the query. It was confirmed that Mr Vale had actioned this, and that a response had been sent to the Member concerned.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd July 2018 be agreed and signed as a correct record.**

## **19 MATTERS ARISING**

### **CSD 18131**

Members noted the Matters Arising report.

The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services responded to the query concerning why TfL were taking so long to remove graffiti from bus stops. He stated that this was a matter that he was continuing to pursue. The main issue relating to TfL seemed to have changed from graffiti to grass cutting, and it was noted that one side of the A21 had not been cut.

**RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report is noted.**

## **20 POLICE UPDATE**

The Chairman welcomed Chief Superintendent Jeff Boothe to the Committee. Mr Boothe was the new Tri-Borough Police Commander for Bromley, Croydon and Sutton. Mr Boothe apologised for not being able to attend the previous meeting of the Committee. It was noted that Mr Boothe would also be attending the Crime Summit which was scheduled for September 29<sup>th</sup>.

Mr Boothe stated that budgetary considerations were not the only reason why the MET was changing to the new combined BCU (Basic Command Unit) models. Previously, there had been 32 Borough Police Commanders, now there would be 12--in charge of 12 BCUs. Some BCUs would be comprised of two boroughs, some three, and some four. Mr Boothe had been in post since May 2018, and his Command Team had been in post since June 2018.

Each BCU would consist of five strands with a Superintendent in charge of each strand.

The five strands were:

- Response
- Neighbourhood Management
- Investigations
- Safeguarding
- HQ Corporate Functions

The role of the Borough Commander was now different. The role of the Tri-Borough Commander now involved having oversight of each strand. It was noted that Bromley was the largest area of responsibility in terms of geographical size, but 50% of the crime emanated from Croydon.

The H.Q. function would control how resources would be deployed going forward. It was anticipated that resources would be deployed locally, and that Bromley response teams would stay in Bromley. It was hoped that effectiveness in deployment would be enhanced and that the quality of response would be improved. If an urgent call was made concerning domestic violence or other serious offences, then a CID vehicle would attend first. This would be managed by an Operations Room.

The new model was not expected to be fully operational until February 2019. Mr Boothe assured the Committee that lessons had been learnt from previous BCU trials, not least in terms of response times. The Mayor had made a commitment that there would be two ward officers and a PCSO in each ward, and this would be honoured. All wards would be fully resourced, and these assets would be ring fenced.

There would be an uplift in resources into Neighbourhood Policing. Additional officers would be assigned to schools and from the Neighbourhood Tasking Team if there was a particular problem in a ward that required extra attention for a period of time.

A Partnership and Prevention Team (P&P Team) was being introduced. The P&P Team would be responsible for identifying and developing good practice with respect to Neighbourhood Policing.

A Member commented that she was glad the commitment to ward officers and PCSOs was being maintained. She asked how long the additional resources from the Tasking Team would be assigned to a particular ward. Mr Boothe answered that the Tasking Team would remain until the problem was solved, and then they would be used elsewhere as required.

A Member expressed concern about the transport arrangements for ward officers. She wanted to see a more effective way of officers getting to their areas of operation. A Member expressed the view that Neighbourhood Teams should ideally be located in their own ward. Mr Boothe explained that efforts were being made to work collaboratively with other blue light partners in terms of co-location. Barriers to this were funding and security arrangements. The police had also been exploring the idea of using sponsored vehicles. A Member asked if an update concerning these matters could be provided at the next meeting.

Mr Boothe made the following points regarding the transport arrangements for ward officers:

- The reality had to be understood that there were only a finite number of vehicles available

- An assessment would need to be made of what was the quickest and most practical way for officers to be transported
- The use of buses had the benefit of providing assurances from a visible police presence
- Relocation would take place as soon as practically possible

The Chairman pointed out that the matter concerning transport arrangements for ward officers had been ongoing for quite some time. Mr Boothe stated that matters had now improved thanks to the introduction of new technology. It was now the case that officers were not required to return to base unless they had to deal with a prisoner or had finished their shift.

A Member asked if cover for ward officers was available in cases of maternity leave. Commander Boothe responded that the answer to this was 'no'. The police had a budget for officers, and to employ extra resources to cover maternity leave would be an addition to the budget that was not available. If required, the Tasking Team could be utilised.

A co-opted member expressed concern over what he perceived as deficiencies in youth engagement with the police. Mr Boothe responded that this was an important issue, and the police were looking at what actions they could take in this respect. They would be looking at what had proved to be successful models in other boroughs and had been working with an independent advisory group. The police had also been engaging with Youth Council meetings. Assurance was provided to the Committee that there would be effective engagement with young people.

A Member queried if police office buildings in Bromley were going to be retained. This was because it was mentioned at the previous meeting, that as a result of a judicial review, the move to close police office buildings in the borough had been stopped. The Committee was informed that this matter was ongoing as the judicial review had been appealed.

Mention was made of the Knife and Serious Violence Action Plan. The Action Plan was being developed by the Safer Bromley Partnership. It was noted that boroughs would develop individual action plans. It was important to identify the benefits that could be provided by third sector organisations. The Chairman requested that when it was completed, the Action Plan should be presented to the PDS Committee.

The Investigations strand would be led by CID. The reactive side would be maintained, as would the emphasis on covert pro-active work. The CID would be based at Sutton and Bromley.

Mr Boothe updated Members concerning the Safeguarding strand. He referred to the 'Sapphire' Team which was the team that dealt with issues of rape, sexual abuse and child abuse. This was currently a team that was

located centrally. Under the new arrangements, Mr Boothe would be taking over control locally. The Child Abuse Investigations Team would continue and would be better resourced. The 'Missing' people team would also continue. Safeguarding was now seen by the Mayor and the MET as a key area, and there would be Safeguarding Teams located in all three boroughs.

It was noted that Bromley's policing priorities differed from MOPAC's. Assurance was provided that the police would be managing Bromley's local policing priorities. A co-opted member mentioned the link between gangs and CSE. Mr Boothe affirmed that this was an area that the police were looking at and would be adopting a holistic approach.

A co-opted member raised a question on behalf of MIND. If there was an elderly person wandering around in a confused state, which organisation would be responsible for that person. Mr Boothe clarified that if there was an emergency situation where there was a threat to life, then the police should be called. Longer term issues would be the responsibility of partners.

A Member asked who would be in charge of the Control Room, and it was clarified that this would be an Inspector. He then asked if it would be the case that in reality, the demand for resources would be drawn to Croydon. Commander Boothe responded that he had equal responsibility for three areas, and it would not be good practice to focus resources in just one borough.

Mr Boothe illustrated how tri-borough resources could be shared by citing an example of work that had been undertaken in Penge with respect to gang issues. Croydon officers had been used in Penge because of their expertise in dealing with gang related issues. The police were seeking to improve demand management. It was now the case that all ASB could be reported online, and the fact that there would be more police resourced to neighbourhood policing should reduce the number of calls to the police.

It was noted that the gang problem in Penge was current and not just historical. Mr Boothe stated that he was fully sighted with respect to the gang issue in Penge.

A Member sought clarity concerning what numbers should now be used to call the police under the new arrangements, and asked if the phone numbers of ward officers could be provided. She also said that a problem existed with ward officers not making call backs. Superintendent Knight advised that the police wanted to develop a localised ability to make call backs. A consistent approach was required. The local Safer Neighbourhood Team would retain their numbers, and the 101 service would remain. Online reporting could be used for ASB, and this information would be fed back to Neighbourhood Officers.

A Member queried if Neighbourhood Officers were informed of issues that were raised via the 101 service. Mr Boothe commented that there was a need

for more joined up and integrated communications. It was hoped that the P&P Team would help to improve this area of operations.

The Chairman asked Mr Boothe if he would be able to attend future meetings. Mr Boothe responded that all meetings were currently under review to see who would be the best person to attend specific meetings. In terms of the PP&E PDS meeting, the police would be seeking a clear understanding of what the Committee required from police representatives. Generally speaking, the main police contact from a partnership perspective would be Superintendent Craig Knight. It may be the case that if in future the Committee was seeking an update on a strand other than Neighbourhood Management, then an alternate Superintendent may be assigned to attend.

The Chairman thanked Commander Boothe for attending the meeting and for answering questions from the Committee.

Superintendent Craig Knight continued with the police update after Mr Boothe had left. He informed the Committee that his background was in Neighbourhood Policing and that he felt that the new BCU structure would be a better operating model.

Mr Knight briefed the Committee with the following data which was all based on the rolling 12 months:

- ASB offences had risen by 34
- Burglary had risen by 4.9% which equated to 118 offences.
- Robbery had reduced by 11%
- Vehicle crime had risen by 1.7% which equated to 12 offences
- Knife Crime and Serious Violence offences had reduced by 4%

The rise in burglary offences was partly due to the criminal activities of organised crime gangs, but a number of arrests had now been made.

Mr Knight attributed the reduction of knife crime and serious violence to an increased use of stop and search for which he applauded officers. The number of offences relating to being in possession of a knife had increased, but this was because perpetrators were being caught due to the stop and search policy. The Superintendent explained how the use of a Section 60 order with respect to stop and search worked and also briefed the Committee about the use of 'dispersal orders'.

The percentage of I calls responded to within the target time was 84%, which was one or two percent below the MET average. The probable cause of this was the size of the borough. In the rolling 12 months, Bromley police had received 10,860 I calls, which equated to 905 per month. During the rolling 12 month period, 14,828 S calls had been logged. The response time for these calls indicated that 81% of calls had been answered within the target response time of 80%.

A co-opted member stated that she was aware of work that was ongoing to develop a stop and search policy group. Mr Knight appraised the Committee that similarly the police were working in consultation with a community group to refine stop and search policy. There was a possibility that in the future the community group would be allowed to observe stop and search operations.

The Committee received an update on the injunction that had been obtained against the Travellers subsequent to a recent incursion. The Court would decide whether or not the injunction could be extended as it was originally limited to three months. LBB and the police had been consulting on how to respond if the injunction was breached. The injunction did not apply to private land.

A Member enquired about an accident and subsequent fatality that had occurred recently in Bromley North. Mr Knight was unable to comment on this incident as it was being investigated.

A Member was concerned that Travellers were committing offences but not being arrested. Mr Knight assured that where evidence was forthcoming, Travellers would be arrested just the same as anyone else. In fact there had been some arrests in the previous three months. The Member asked if a report could be brought back to the Committee which detailed the arrests that had been made. It was the case that in many instances, individuals may report crimes, but would not wish to appear in court to provide evidence.

The Chairman requested that information be provided to the Committee before future meetings, so that Members had time to look at the information before the meeting. Mr Knight responded that this was not a problem, but it would help if the Chairman could clarify what information was required.

The Chairman thanked Superintendent Knight for updating the Committee, and for responding to questions.

**RESOLVED that the police update is noted.**

## **21 PORTFOLIO HOLDER UPDATE**

The Portfolio Holder (Councillor Kate Lymer) updated the Committee as follows:

LBB had witnessed an intense period of multiple traveller incursions over the summer period.

She had spent many days during the summer period, dealing with emails and also fielding messages via Twitter. She had issued daily press releases and had provided information to the Daily Mail on more than one occasion. She praised the joint work that had been undertaken by the police and LBB in dealing with the Traveller incursion.

During this time, a three month court injunction had been obtained against the Travellers. Residents seemed to be satisfied with the joint response that had been generated by LBB and the police. The Chairman had drafted a letter to be sent to all of the Friends Groups thanking them for their assistance in the clear up after the Travellers had left. The letter also provided an update concerning the injunction and offering practical advice going forward.

The web link concerning this on the Bromley Council Website is:

[https://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/1419/borough\\_wide\\_illegal\\_encampment\\_injunction\\_successfully\\_granted](https://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/1419/borough_wide_illegal_encampment_injunction_successfully_granted)

The Portfolio Holder had met with Andrew Rogers (LBB Communications Executive) to plan the launch of the 'Hall of Shame' which had been agreed by the Executive. The 'Hall of Shame' would display details of individuals who had been convicted of offences such as fly tipping, blue badge fraud and doorstep scams. It was hoped that the 'Hall of Shame' would act as a deterrent.

A cold caller had been convicted and given a four year prison sentence for swindling a seventy year old man for non-existent loft and roof problems which he charged £17k for.

The Portfolio Holder stated that as Bromley's 'SCAMBassador' she had attended a joint Trading Standards and CAB stall in the Glades during the National Trading Standards Week in July.

The Portfolio Holder had visited Keston Police Dogs Centre to hand over some seized counterfeit clothing which could be used to train the dogs.

The Portfolio Holder would be visiting Barclays Bank in Chislehurst to present them with a certificate and a thank you letter. This was because of an excellent piece of work that had been undertaken between the bank, LBB and Greenwich Trading Standards which had resulted in the safeguarding of vulnerable residents.

Emergency Planning had been very busy over the summer, dealing with water shortages, cars driving into houses, and multiple fires to both buildings and grasslands. This led to LBB issuing a press release banning all barbeques in the parks during the summer period.

In August, the Portfolio Holder met the inspectors who would be judging whether the Purple Flag award could be renewed in Beckenham. The response was awaited but the inspection seemed to go very well and the Portfolio Holder was confident that the Purple Flag award would be renewed. (It was confirmed at the meeting that Beckenham had retained its Purple Flag status).

Agreement was needed with MOPAC in connection with LBB's two Local Crime Priorities. ASB and high harm crimes (domestic abuse, sexual abuse,

child sexual abuse, weapons and hate crime) were pan London priorities for all boroughs. LBB submitted burglary and non-domestic violence (town centre night economy violence)) as Bromley's two main priorities for the police for the coming year.

The Portfolio Holder attended an APPG (All Party Parliamentary Group) London round table meeting at Portcullis House in June, which focussed on Serious Youth Crime. She brought up the issue of gang nominals being moved into Bromley without any notification being provided by other boroughs. It was agreed that this was something that would be looked at, and would be dealt with by the Deputy Chief Executive.

A Member stressed the importance of ward officer offices/buildings remaining open. He asked if pressure could be maintained to this end. The Chairman suggested that Councillors should assist the police in identifying suitable buildings that could be used as police ward offices.

A murder had been committed during the end of August in Bickley. The chief suspect was in custody and was the victim's son. The police were of the opinion that the Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) threshold had been met. The Portfolio Holder had to decide whether to have a DHR or not. She would have to write to the Home Office and inform them of whether or not LBB would be conducting a DHR. If LBB decided to progress with a DHR they would be responsible for managing it and for appointing an independent chairman. The cost of this would be in the region of £10k. The decision had been made to progress with the DHR, and the Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety would write to the Home Office and inform them of the decision.

The Portfolio Holder reminded everyone that the Crime Summit would be held on the 29<sup>th</sup> September. The 'Bromley Stars' awards event was also held in the summer. She congratulated the Bromley Mentoring Initiative which won the award for 'Voluntary Team of the Year'. She also congratulated the Trading Standards Team who won 'Team of the Year' award once again.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder update is noted.**

## **HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT**

### **22 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were no questions to the Portfolio Holder from Councillors or Members of the Public.

#### **a CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 1ST QUARTER 2018/19**

## **FSD 18074**

The Committee was presented with the Capital Programme Monitoring Report. This was with respect to the first quarter period of 2018/2019.

On 11th July 2018, the Executive had received a report summarising the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the first quarter of 2018/19 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2018/19 to 2021/22. The report highlighted the changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Public Protection and Enforcement Portfolio.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder notes the report and confirms the changes that had been agreed by the Executive on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018.**

## **23 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE**

### **a PLANNED ENFORCEMENT OF LEGISLATION WHICH REGULATES THE LETTING AGENTS AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SECTOR**

#### **ES18068**

The report was presented to the Committee for initial scrutiny and would subsequently be presented to the Executive to seek approval to use the planned enforcement of legislation which regulated the letting agent and property management sector in the Borough.

The report explained that all letting agents and property management operators in England were now required to be a member of a government approved redress scheme.

The Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety informed the Committee that this was a new area of enforcement for LBB. It was planned to create a temporary post for up to three months so that the level of compliance could be established. Non-compliance would be followed with enforcement action which could include the use of penalty charge notices. The scheme would be funded from the £48,125 which was now available from the Asset Recovery Incentivisation Scheme.

A Member referred to section 6.3 of the report which stated:

*At this stage it is not known how many, if any, non-compliant letting agents there are in the borough, and therefore any potential income that may be generated from issuing the FPNs cannot be quantified.*

She asked why LBB should spend money in this area if it could not be quantified how much money LBB may recover via enforcement. The Head of

Trading Standards and Community Safety responded by revealing data that had been gathered from a recent London Trading Standards Survey. The survey revealed that 53% of businesses had failed to comply with the requirement for displaying fees, charges and penalties; 37% were not registered with a deposit holding scheme.

Mr Vale expressed the view that the planned enforcement of the legislation would be a good investment and would also have the additional positive effect of benefiting vulnerable people. It was also the case that the enforcement of the legislation was gathering momentum across the capital.

A Member referred to section 3.1 of the report which explained that letting agents and property management operators in England were required to join a redress scheme. He asked if they had to pay a fee to join the scheme. Mr Vale said that he would look into this and come back with an answer.

The Chairman commented that the enforcement of legislation which regulates the letting agents and property management sector may need to be an enforcement item that will be required to be added to the Portfolio Plan.

**RESOLVED that the report is noted and that the Committee's views are fed back to the Executive via the Portfolio Holder.**

## **24 REGULATON OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT AUTHORISATIONS REPORT**

### **ES18071**

The report on the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act Authorisations was presented to the Committee by the Head of Trading Standards and Community Safety.

The report was written to ensure the Committee was kept up to date on RIPA applications being undertaken on behalf of the Council. It was a requirement that the Council regularly reviewed and updated their RIPA policy and processes in line with Home Office Codes of Practice, legislation and guidance.

The Committee was being asked to note the report.

Mr Vale explained that there was a statutory duty to provide regular updates with respect to RIPA, so that it could be seen that the Council were using their investigative powers correctly. It was noted that the primary objective of RIPA was to ensure that covert investigations protected the rights of individuals, and also protected Council officers from legal challenge.

The Committee heard that before RIPA could be used, a serious crime threshold would need to be applied. This would align to offenses that would carry a maximum prison sentence of six months or more, or that related to underage sales of tobacco or alcohol. Enforcement powers had to be used in

accordance with Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.

The Committee was informed that a new code of practice had been issued by the Home Office on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2018. The Council's policy was under review so that it could be aligned with Home Office guidance, and a report on this would come back to the Committee next year.

A Member asked for a definition of fly-tipping. The Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement clarified that this would equate to approximately 3-4 large black bags of rubbish.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted and that an update report relating to RIPA policy be brought back to the Committee in 2019.**

## **25 ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY--FUTURE SCRUTINY**

### **ES 18069**

The Enforcement Activity (Future Scrutiny) report was presented by the Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement.

The report identified the different Enforcement areas which were now the responsibility of the Public Protection and Enforcement Portfolio, and highlighted the strategic key performance indicators that pertained to enforcement within the areas of Public Protection, Planning Enforcement, Neighbourhood Management (Street Enforcement) and Parking Enforcement.

The Chairman expressed his gratitude for the report and said that the report had been well received.

Post Grenfell it had been decided that a new performance indicator should be added relating to fire safety. The Vice Chairman stated that he was happy to accept the initial performance indicators, but that in the future the various indicators may be subject to challenge.

**RESOLVED that the report is noted, and that future reports will be produced for each enforcement area in line with the proposed work plan.**

## **26 FLY TIPPING ACTION INITIATIVE REPORT**

### **ES18069**

The Committee was presented with the Fly Tipping Action Initiative report that had been drafted by the Assistant Director for Environment and Neighbourhood Management.

Members heard that the action plan was being developed and that an update report would follow in about six months.

A Member was pleased to see that target hardening was being looked at. She commented that materials used needed to be unbreakable. The Vice Chairman stated that 'hard targets' had in the past been cut down by angle grinders.

A Member was pleased to hear that Environmental Enforcement Campaigns were being used, alongside multi-agency stop and search operations. She suggested that consideration could be given to attaching conditions to planning applications stipulating that waste carriers with licenses should be used for the disposal of waste. The Executive Director for Environmental and Community Services stated that he would take the suggestion to the Chief Planner for consideration.

A Member raised the issue of public waste bins outside of shops and schools that were being used by the public for general household waste. It was noted that if the use of signage and patrols failed in this regard, then it may be the case that the bins would need to be removed.

A co-opted member stated that there was a particular difficulty for certain groups of people that lived in flats where there were no bins available; sometimes this problem was compounded by language problems. The Chairman asked to be informed of where these locations were.

A Member asked how they could know if an area that they were concerned about, was on the fly tipping hotspot list. It was suggested that the Assistant Director for Environment and Neighbourhood Management be asked to run a new report that would identify the hotspot locations.

The Director for Environment reported on the successful seizure of a vehicle that had been used by Travellers for fly tipping. If the vehicle was claimed, then it was likely that there would be prosecution for fly tipping; if the vehicle was unclaimed then it would be crushed.

The Chairman thanked Dan Jones (Director for Environment) for his service to the Council.

**RESOLVED that the report is noted and that the Committee receive a six monthly update report on the progress of the action plan.**

## **27 RISK REGISTER EXEMPTION ORAL UPDATE**

There was a verbal update given on the Risk Register from the Head of Performance Management and Business Support (Sarah Foster).

Ms Foster referred to the risks that had been highlighted by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) regarding food safety. The FSA had accepted the difficulties that LBB was facing with respect to the recruitment of food safety

officers, and had therefore agreed to a modification in the work plan which had now been finalised.

It was noted that there was a national shortage of food safety officers. This was a matter that the Assistant Director for Public Protection would be raising with the Corporate Leadership Team.

An update with respect to the Mortuary Contract was provided in the Part two section of the meeting.

## **28 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND ENFORCEMENT CONTRACTS REGISTER REPORT AND DATABASE EXTRACT--PART 1**

### **ES18066**

The Part 1 Contract Register report drafted by the Head of Performance and Business Support was presented to the Committee.

The report showed an extract from September 2018's Contracts Register for detailed scrutiny by the PDS Committee. The report was based on information covering all Portfolios, which was produced on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2018 and presented to Contracts Sub-Committee on 19 September 2018.

Members noted and commented on the report.

### **RESOLVED that:**

- 1) The Contract Register report and the appended £50k Contracts Register is noted**
- 2) The Committee notes that the Contracts Register in Part 2 contained additional, potentially commercially sensitive material in its commentary.**

## **29 WORK PROGRAMME**

### **CSD18130**

Members noted the Work Programme report.

An updated copy of the work programme was tabled at the meeting.

### **RESOLVED that the Work Programme report is noted.**

## **30 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 4<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

The meeting would take place as usual at Bromley Civic Centre at 7.00pm.

The Chairman thanked Cameron Ward from Bromley Youth Council for his contribution to the meeting, and for staying to the end.

**31 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION)(VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000**

**32 CONTRACTS REGISTER DATABASE EXTRACT--PART 2**

Members discussed the Mortuary Contract under the Part 2 section of the meeting as this was deemed to be commercially sensitive.

**33 PPE/PDS ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Members noted and commented on the PP&E PDS Enforcement Indicators for 2018/2019.

The Meeting ended at 10.00 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank